

and, if convicted, they can be incarcerated. Others may be sent to another country, maybe returned to their own country of origin.

One of these prisoners I happen to know a little about because he is represented by an attorney in Chicago. He is Palestinian. He is from Gaza and was captured when he was 19 years old. He has now been held in prison for 7 years. He is now 26 years old. Last year, our government notified him and his attorney that we have no current charges against him. They have been trying to find a place to send him. He stayed another year in prison while we are trying to determine where he should be sent.

Each of these 240 cases is a challenge to make sure we come to a just conclusion as to each person and never compromise the safety of the United States.

A little over a week ago, the President went to the National Archives and gave a speech about Guantanamo and what we are going to do, and he made it clear that some of these people will be tried in our courts, some of them may end up in prisons in the United States, some of them may end up being held as long as they are enemy combatants and a danger to the United States, and some may be sent to other countries. They are trying to work out 240 different cases. It is not an easy assignment.

The reason I raise this is because it is clear that as long as Guantanamo remains open, it is going to be an irritant to many around the world and lead to the recruitment of more people to engage in terrorism against the United States. Don't accept my conclusion on that. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, ADM Mike Mullen, said:

The concern I've had about Guantanamo in these wars is it has been a symbol, and one which has been a recruiting symbol for those extremists and jihadists who would fight us.

On the floor of the Senate this morning, shortly after the President's speech, the Republican minority leader, Senator MCCONNELL of Kentucky—as he has many times before—came to discuss Guantanamo. He said explicitly—and he may have said this before, but I just want to make it clear that I am reading from the transcript of what he said on the floor this morning—“Like most Americans, I'm for keeping Guantanamo open.” So he clearly disagrees with the President. He wants Guantanamo to stay open. I certainly hope that it doesn't. I don't want this recruiting tool for terrorists to continue.

Senator MCCONNELL has raised the question repeatedly of whether it is safe for us to bring Guantanamo detainees to the United States for a trial or for incarceration. I think it is, based on the fact that we currently have 347 convicted terrorists serving time in American prisons today. Over half of them are international terrorists, and some of them are in my State of Illinois at the Marion Federal peniten-

tiary. They are being held today. As I traveled around southern Illinois last week, I didn't hear one person step up and say: I am worried about the terrorists being held at the Marion prison.

In fact, I went to the Marion prison, met with the corrections officers and guards, and asked them this: What do you think about Guantanamo detainees?

Well, they were somewhere between insulted and angry at the notion that they couldn't safely incarcerate a Guantanamo detainee. One of the guards said to me: Senator, we have more dangerous people than that in this prison. We have serial killers, we have sexual predators, we have terrorists from Colombia, we had John Gotti—the syndicate kingpin. We held these people safely, and we can do it. That is what we do for a living. So don't you worry about putting them in this prison. We can take care of them. We have not had an escape, and we are not going to.

So when Senators come to the floor and suggest that these detainees cannot even be brought to the United States for trial and held in a prison while they are going to trial, that it is somehow unsafe to America, defies logic and experience. If there is one strength we have in this country—and you can debate it—we know how to incarcerate people. We have put more people in prison per capita than any nation on Earth. We hold them safely, certainly in the supermax facilities, and we must continue to. And this idea that we have to keep Guantanamo open because there is not a prison in America where they can be held safely is not true. The 347 convicted terrorists being held in America today are living proof that is not true.

This tactic of opposing the closing of Guantanamo is based on fear—fear that is being pedaled on this Senate floor that these detainees cannot be held safely and securely in the United States. It is the same fear that led people to conclude that our Constitution wasn't strong enough to deal with a war on terrorism, and therefore we had to look for ways to go around it when it came to wiretapping and interrogating prisoners. These are the same people who had fear that our courts in America couldn't handle the cases before them if they dealt with terrorism, though, in fact, they have done that many times over. It is the same fear that our law enforcement authorities can't do their job effectively, when, in fact, they can.

We cannot as a nation be guided by fear. And those politicians who come up and make speeches, whether it is on radio or television or on the floor of Congress, and who try to appeal to the fear of the American people aren't doing us any favor. We are not a strong nation cowering in fear. We are a strong nation of principle, of values, that can stand up to the world and say: We will not in any way harbor or encourage terrorism and extremism. We

are proud of our values. We can stand by them even in the toughest of times. And we are proud of the institutions of America that we have created and that make us strong.

I don't think those who come to this argument out of weakness and fear have a leg to stand on. And when the argument was made on the floor this morning that we should keep Guantanamo open, I would like to think that those who heard President Obama in Cairo, Egypt, and across the Muslim world today and who were encouraged by his aspirations to higher values and a better place for the United States will understand that this statement by one Senator on the floor of the Senate doesn't represent where America needs to go.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. DURBIN. I wish to conclude briefly by saying we have a chance to do the right thing, to close Guantanamo in a safe and secure fashion, to put these prisoners in supermax facilities, to stop the use of Guantanamo as a recruitment device for al-Qaida. Turning them loose in countries around the world may mean the release of terrorists and more problems to come.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. BUNNING. Madam President, we are in morning business, is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

FAMILY SMOKING PREVENTION AND TOBACCO CONTROL ACT

Mr. BUNNING. Madam President, I have four amendments I wish to discuss to the pending bill. I will not call them up but I wish to discuss them. When the bill is presented on the floor, then I will come back and talk about the specific amendments that are going to be considered in the first tranche of amendments.

First, I rise today in strong opposition to the tobacco regulatory bill on the floor. This sweeping legislation would dramatically increase the FDA's regulatory authority outside the scope of original congressional intent. This is something that Congress did not intend to give the FDA when we wrote the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, and that intent was even upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court in 2000. Yet there are still some of my colleagues out here who believe it would be safer for the American public to regulate tobacco under the FDA. They argue that, by doing so, we will help reduce the negative effect of smoking and prevent underage smokers.

As a grandfather of 39 grandchildren, believe me, I want to keep cigarettes out of the hands of kids. But the bill before us today does not do that. It is nothing more than an attempt to eliminate our national tobacco industry. The big problem with this approach is that our Nation's tobacco

farmers are the ones who are going to pay the price.

Not once in this bill did I read any language that would provide any type of protection to our tobacco farmers—not even once. This is why I have introduced the four amendments. Let me give you their numbers: 1236, 1237, 1238, and 1239.

If the FDA is going to regulate tobacco and require sweeping changes within the industry, I want to ensure that farmers have a voice at the negotiating table. My amendments do this. Not only do they allow for fair grower representation, but they help ensure that those who will be most affected by this legislation will not be forced to pay the biggest price.

Let me be clear that I oppose the FDA regulation of tobacco. I have said that as long as tobacco is a legal commodity, it should be regulated through the USDA, the United States Department of Agriculture, not the FDA. If we are going to discuss giving the FDA this authority through this or similar legislation, I want to make sure that we consider the impact on agriculture.

In Kentucky, the family farm is the foundation for who we are as a State. For over a century, the family farm in Kentucky has centered around one crop—tobacco. Tobacco barns and small plots of tobacco dot the Kentucky landscape. We are proud of our heritage and proud that tobacco plays a role in our history. Even after the buy-out, tobacco still plays a prominent role in my State's agricultural landscape.

We have tried to broaden our agricultural base. We have had some success with several types of vegetables, cattle, and even raising catfish. But at the end of the day, nothing brings as much of a return to the small farmer in Kentucky as tobacco. It is big business for small farmers.

With the current economic conditions, more and more farmers in my State are turning to growing tobacco to supplement their income or, in a lot of cases, tobacco is their sole source of income. The money they get from tobacco pays their mortgages, puts their kids through school, and actually allows them to stay on the farm.

Outside of the western part of my State, Kentucky does not have tens of thousands of acres of flat land. We have a lot of green, rolling hills and a climate where tobacco thrives. It can be raised very cheaply on small plots of land that simply cannot accommodate other crops. Whether we like it or not, tobacco remains an economic staple for rural Kentucky. It is profitable and farmers rely on it. That might not be popular today, but it is an economic reality that we have to face.

Whatever the opponents of tobacco say, there is no denying that this bill will add unnecessary mandates and expenses on the farmers in the attempt to punish the big tobacco companies. Sure, this bill will hurt big tobacco companies. They might have to move

offshore. They might have to start exporting more of their products. But they will survive. But Kentucky's tobacco farmers do not have these options available to them. They are the ones who are going to be hurt by this type of legislation.

Some of my colleagues might support this legislation because they wish to outlaw tobacco. The last time I looked, tobacco was still a legal product in this country. If my colleagues want to make it illegal, let them be honest and upfront about it. Let's consider legislation to make it illegal. We can fight that here, out on the floor of the Senate. But let's not keep trying to slip it through the back door, through over-regulation and taxes in the name of preventing underage smoking.

Children should not have cigarettes. They should not. This is why we have age limits and advertising limits. We should do all that we can to keep cigarettes out of the hands of our kids. But the bill before us is not the answer. We can do better and should do better. All this bill does is move the regulation of a legal product from several agencies to another, one that has no jurisdiction to regulate it.

The only people this bill is going to hurt in the end are not the big tobacco companies, but the small and honest farmers who depend on tobacco to pay their bills. This is why I have offered four farmer-friendly amendments to the bill. I want to explain for a few minutes the four.

One, Bunning amendment No. 1236, clarifies that nothing in this bill would prevent our farmers from growing and cultivating tobacco as they have been able to do for the past hundred-plus years.

My second amendment, No. 1237, establishes a grower grant program that would help ease the financial burden of this bill on our farmers.

Amendment No. 1238 gives growers a seat at the negotiating table. The underlying bill establishes a Tobacco Scientific Advisory Committee made up of 12 members. Seven of those members are from the medical field to ensure that public health needs are taken into account. There is one of the public, and three representatives from the tobacco industry. There are two manufacturers and one grower. All members of the committee are voting except for the last three—the tobacco representatives. My amendment is simple. It gives the tobacco representatives the right to vote and adds two more grower positions. That way, all three forms of tobacco—burley, flue cured and dark leaf—are represented at the negotiating table.

The final Bunning amendment, No. 1239, asks the FDA if they are going to impose any new restrictions or requirements on farmers, then they should consider and conduct a feasibility study so that we know the effect on the farm level.

When my amendments come up, I encourage my colleagues to support them.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. ALEXANDER. I ask unanimous consent that morning business be extended until 1 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

AUTO STOCK TAXPAYER ACT

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, today along with Senator BENNETT and Senator MCCONNELL and Senator KYL, I will introduce the Auto Stock for Every Taxpayer Act—to require the Treasury to distribute to individual taxpayers all its stock in the new General Motors and Chrysler within 1 year following the emergence of the new GM from bankruptcy proceedings. This is the best way to get the auto companies out of the hands of Washington bureaucrats and politicians and into the hands of the American people in the marketplace where they belong. So instead of the Treasury owning 60 percent of shares in the new GM and 8 percent of Chrysler, you would own them if you were one of about 120 million individual Americans who paid Federal taxes on April 15.

This is the fastest way to get the stock out of the hands of Washington and back into the hands of the American people who paid for it. To keep it simple, and to help the little guy and girl also have an ownership stake in America's future, Treasury would give each taxpayer an equal number of the available shares.

The Treasury Department has said it wants to sell its auto shares as soon as possible, but Fritz Henderson, president and CEO of General Motors, told Senators and Congressmen in a telephone call on Monday that while it is the Treasury's decision to make, this is a "very large amount" of stock, and that orderly offering of those shares to establish a market may have to be "managed down over a period of years."

Those shares might not be worth very much at first, but put them away and one day they might contribute something toward a college education. For example, General Motors' 610 million shares were only worth 75 cents just before bankruptcy, but they were worth \$40 per share 2 years ago, and \$75 a few years before that.

Already we can see what government ownership of car companies will look